Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form					
Application No.: 10/007,003 Examiner: Te Y. Chen		First Named Applicant: Patel, et al.  Art Unit: 2161 Status of Application: Pending			
Tentative Participants: (1) Te Y. Chen (2) SPE - Mofit Apu					
(3) Group Director (4) Art Rose, Amy Chun & Michael Erickson					
As soon as convenie Proposed Date of Interview: for examiner			Proposed Time:(AM/P		_ (AM/PM)
Type of Interview Requested: (1) [X] Telephonic (2) [ ] Personal (3) [ ] Video Conference					
Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [ ] YES [X NO If yes, provide brief description:					
Issues To Be Discussed					
Issues (Pai Ohi ata)	Claims/		Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(Rej., Obj., etc)	Fig. #s	Prior Art	[]	[]	[]
(2)			[]	[]	[]
(3)			[]	[]	[]
(4) [ ] Continuation Shee	Attached	<del> </del>	[]	[]	[]
Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: Please See Attached					
An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).  This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.					
Applican Applican	Examiner/SPE Signature				
Art S. Rose					
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative					
28,038  Registration Number, if applicable					

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

## Application No. 10/007,003 (Patel, et al.) Filed November 9, 2001

SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR PROVIDING A DISTRIBUTED FILE SYSTEM UTILIZING METADATA TO TRACK INFORMATION ABOUT DATA STORED THROUGHOUT THE SYSTEM

## PROPOSED INTERVIEW AGENDA

Teleconference, January 2008

- A. We request help to understand how the Evans reference anticipates each and every claim element. Evans is the same reference used by the Examiner in the previous Office Action as the basis for an obviousness rejection, in which the Examiner expressly stated that Evans does not disclose "that the allocator module distributes the claimed subject matters across the storage modules."
- **B.** Furthermore, we would like to discuss the fact that Evans is not even in the same area as the claimed invention because Evans teaches multicast data distribution over a network, and the claimed invention is a distributed, file-based storage system
- C. Finally, we would like to discuss the <u>136-page declaration</u> that was filed in response to the Examiner's 103 obviousness rejection based on Evans, <u>to which declaration the Examiner provided no response</u>.

INFORMAL PRE-APPEAL CONFERENCE REQUESTED: WE REQUEST THAT THE GROUP DIRECTOR AND SPE EXAMINE THIS ISSUE BEFORE APPLICANT EXPENDS SIGNIFICANT TIME AND RESOURCES TO APPEAL THIS CASE. APPLICANT IS CONCERNED THAT, AFTER THE EXPENSE OF PREPARING AN APPEAL BRIEF, THE REJECTION WILL BE WITHDRAWN AND ANOTHER EQUALLY MERITLESS REJECTION WILL BE ASSERTED.